

SOGANG-HEP 240/98

SNUTP 98-072

Symplectic structure free Chern-Simons Theory

Won Tae Kim, Yong-Wan Kim and Young-Jai Park

Department of Physics and Basic Science Research Institute,

Sogang University, C.P.O. Box 1142, Seoul 100-611, Korea

(July 23)

Abstract

The second class constraints algebra of the abelian Chern-Simons theory is rigorously studied in terms of the Hamiltonian embedding in order to obtain the first class constraint system. The symplectic structure of fields due to the second class constraints disappears in the resulting system. Then we obtain a new type of Chern-Simons action which has an infinite set of the irreducible first class constraints and exhibits new extended local gauge symmetries implemented by these first class constraints.

PACS number(s): 11.10.Ef, 11.10.Kk.

Typeset using REVTeX

Chern–Simons (CS) theories [1] have been enormously studied in the various arena. One of the intriguing problems of CS theories is that CS Lagrangian from the point of view of constrained system gives unusual second class constraints even though it is invariant up to a total divergence under the local gauge transformation. This peculiar property of CS theories is essentially due to the symplectic structure [2] which is a key ingredient of CS systems. Meanwhile second class constraint system has been generically regarded as a gauge fixed version of gauge invariant system [3], which has been studied in the context of anomalous gauge theory [4]. Therefore CS theories may have some kinds of unknown local symmetry if second class constraints are converted into first class ones. This means that the intrinsic symplectic structure of CS theories can be interpreted as a gauge fixed form of gauge invariant theory which is symplectic free. Then what is the additional local symmetry in connection with the symplectic structure?

It is in general difficult to convert the second class algebra even for the abelian pure CS theory into first class constraint system by using the Stückelberg mechanism [5] since the origin of the second class constraints algebra is unusual compared to the conventional anomalous theory. Therefore Batalin, Fradkin, and Tyutin (BFT) Hamiltonian embedding of a model [8] is very useful, which converts systematically second class constrained system into first class one. According to the usual treatment [6,7,9–11] of the BFT formalism, one simply identifies auxiliary fields with a pair of conjugate fields. This procedure in the CS theory however gives an undesirable final expression [6,10] in that the original action has not been reproduced when we choose the unitary gauge [6,7], and the additional action so called Wess–Zumino (WZ) action, which is needed to make gauge invariant system, is model–dependent. Furthermore the assumed brackets of the auxiliary fields are not Poisson brackets but Dirac ones.

In this paper by introducing infinite auxiliary fields, we find a new type of WZ action for the abelian pure CS theory so that the total system has fully first class constraints which have not been successful so far. This total action is naturally reduced to the original CS action if one chooses the unitary gauge conditions. Then we obtain the new symmetries

corresponding to the first class constraints related to the symplectic structure as well as the well-known local U(1) gauge symmetry.

Let us start with the abelian pure CS Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} A^\mu \partial^\nu A^\rho. \quad (1)$$

The canonical momenta are given by $\pi_0 = 0$ and $\pi_i = \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^j$. Then we have three primary constraints [12], $\Omega_0 = \pi_0 \approx 0$, $\Omega_i = \pi_i - \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^j \approx 0$ ($i, j = 1, 2$), and a secondary constraint as

$$\Omega_3 = \kappa \epsilon_{ij} \partial^i A^j \approx 0, \quad (2)$$

which is obtained from the stability condition of time evolution of the Ω_0 with the primary Hamiltonian $H_p = H_c + \int d^2x (v^0 \Omega_0 + v^i \Omega_i)$, where the canonical Hamiltonian is $H_c = \int d^2x \mathcal{H}_c = \int d^2x \kappa A^0 \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i A_j$. No more additional constraints are generated from the consistency conditions of the other constraints Ω_i and Ω_3 by fixing the Lagrange multipliers as $v^i = \kappa \partial^i A^0$.

To obtain the maximally irreducible first class constraints [6], we redefine the above primary and secondary constraints as $\omega_0 \equiv \Omega_0$, $\omega_i \equiv \Omega_i$, and

$$\omega_3 \equiv \Omega_3 + \partial^i \Omega_i = \partial^i \pi_i + \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} \partial^i A^j \approx 0. \quad (3)$$

Eliminating the Lagrange multipliers v^i yields the total Hamiltonian density [13] corresponding to the CS Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{H}_T = v^0 \omega_0 - (A^0 - v^3) \omega_3, \quad (4)$$

where the Lagrange multipliers v^0 and v^3 remain undetermined. The total Hamiltonian now naturally generates the Gauss' constraint ω_3 from the time evolution of the constraint ω_0 as

$$\dot{\omega}_0 = \omega_3, \quad \dot{\omega}_\alpha = 0 \quad (\alpha = 1, 2, 3), \quad (5)$$

where overdot represents the time evolution. We therefore have two first class constraints ω_0 and ω_3 , and two second class constraints ω_i which satisfy the constraint algebra

$$\Delta_{ij}(x, y) \equiv \{\omega_i(x), \omega_j(y)\} = -\kappa \epsilon_{ij} \delta(x - y). \quad (6)$$

Upon elimination of the momenta π_i via the method of Dirac [12], we could easily obtain the well-known Dirac brackets for the gauge fields A^i as $\{A^i(x), A^j(y)\} = \epsilon^{ij} \delta(x - y)/\kappa$.

Compared to this kind of the phase space reduction, one can embed a second class structure into first class one by introducing auxiliary fields via *a la* BFT Hamiltonian embedding [8]. In order to make the analysis explicitly, let us first rewrite the CS Lagrangian replacing A^μ with $A^{(0)\mu}$ as

$$\mathcal{L}_0 \equiv \mathcal{L}^{(0)} = \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho} A^{(0)\mu} \partial^\nu A^{(0)\rho}. \quad (7)$$

We now introduce auxiliary fields $A^{(1)i}$ to make the second class constraints ω_i into first class ones satisfying $\{A^{(1)i}(x), A^{(1)j}(y)\} = \vartheta^{ij}(x, y)$. Making use of the auxiliary fields $A^{(1)i}$, we could write the effective first class constraints as $\tilde{\omega}_i(\pi_\mu^{(0)}, A^{(0)\mu}; A^{(1)i}) = \omega_i + \sum_n \varpi_i^{(n)}$ satisfying the boundary condition $\tilde{\omega}_i(\pi_\mu^{(0)}, A^{(0)\mu}; 0) = \omega_i$ as well as requiring the strong involution, *i.e.*, $\{\tilde{\omega}_i, \tilde{\omega}_j\} = 0$. Here $\varpi_i^{(n)}$ is assumed to be proportional to $(A^{(1)i})^n$. In particular, the first order correction in these infinite series is given by

$$\varpi_i^{(1)} = \int d^2y X_{ij}(x, y) A^{(1)j}, \quad (8)$$

and the requirement of the strong involution gives the condition of

$$\Delta_{ij} + \int d^2u d^2v X_{ik}(x, u) \vartheta^{k\ell}(u, v) X_{j\ell}(v, y) = 0. \quad (9)$$

We take the simple solution of ϑ^{ij} and X_{ij} as

$$\vartheta^{ij}(x, y) = \epsilon^{ij} \delta(x - y), \quad (10)$$

$$X_{ij}(x, y) = -\epsilon_{ij} \delta(x - y) / \sqrt{\kappa}. \quad (11)$$

There are some arbitrariness in choosing ϑ^{ij} and X_{ij} from (9) as shown in the literature [6,7,9], which are related to a canonical transformation each other. For the case (10), Eq. (9) is simply reduced to $|\det X_{ij}(x, y)| = 1/\kappa$ and the convenient solution is chosen just like Eq. (11).

By using the ϑ^{ij} and solution of X_{ij} in Eqs. (10) and (11), we obtain the strongly involutive first class constraints which are proportional only to the first order of the auxiliary fields as

$$\tilde{\omega}_i^{(0)} = \pi_i^{(0)} - \frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(0)j} - \sqrt{\kappa}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(1)j} = 0, \quad (12)$$

and the canonical Hamiltonian density

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_c = \kappa A^{(0)0}\epsilon^{ij}\partial_i\left(A^{(0)j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}A^{(1)j}\right), \quad (13)$$

satisfying $\{\tilde{\omega}_i, \tilde{H}_c\} = 0$ and $\{\omega_0, \tilde{H}_c\} = \{\omega_3, \tilde{H}_c\} = 0$. The corresponding Lagrangian of Eq. (13) with two auxiliary fields $A^{(1)i}$ is obtained through the usual path integral as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{(1)} = & -\frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(0)i}\dot{A}^{(0)j} + \kappa A^{(0)0}\epsilon_{ij}\partial^i A^{(0)j} \\ & -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(1)i}\dot{A}^{(1)j} + \sqrt{\kappa}A^{(0)0}\epsilon_{ij}\partial^i A^{(1)j} - \sqrt{\kappa}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(1)i}\dot{A}^{(0)j}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Note that in the usual BFT Hamiltonian embedding of the model we would have identified two auxiliary fields with a pair of conjugate fields as coordinate and momenta [6,7,9–11]. However, it is problematic in our model in that there is no priority to choose them here as the conjugate fields.

To make this problem explicitly, let us now study whether or not the Lagrangian (14) gives first class constraint system at the Poisson bracket level which is an essential spirit of the BFT formalism. The canonical momenta from (14) are $\pi_0^{(0)} = 0$, $\pi_i^{(0)} = \frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(0)j} + \sqrt{\kappa}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(1)j}$, and $\pi_i^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(1)j}$. From the time stability conditions of these primary constraints, we can get one more secondary constraint and after redefining the constraints we can easily obtain the maximally irreducible first class constraints as $\omega_0 = \pi_0^{(0)} \approx 0$, $\omega_3 = \partial^i \pi_i^{(0)} + \frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}\partial^i A^{(0)j} \approx 0$, and

$$\tilde{\omega}_i^{(1)} = \pi_i^{(0)} - \frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(0)j} - \sqrt{\kappa}(\pi_i^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(1)j}) \approx 0, \quad (15)$$

as well as the second class constraints

$$\omega_i^{(1)} = \pi_i^{(1)} - \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(1)j} \approx 0. \quad (16)$$

Therefore there remains still second class constraint system even after the first order of correction. On the other hand, we can calculate the (preliminary) Dirac brackets as

$$\{A^{(1)i}, A^{(1)j}\}_D = \epsilon^{ij}\delta(x-y), \quad (17)$$

which are nothing but the relation introduced in Eq. (10) to make the second class constraints ω_i into first class ones $\tilde{\omega}_i^{(0)}$ in the BFT formalism, *i.e.*, the first class constraints $\tilde{\omega}_i^{(1)}$ reduce to the $\tilde{\omega}_i^{(0)}$. As a result we observe that the auxiliary fields $A^{(1)i}$ introduced to make the second class constraints into first ones do not provide the Poisson bracket structure but Dirac one. The similar feature has appeared in the chiral boson theory [14,15] and recently string and D-branes theory [16]. This makes the BFT Hamiltonian embedding of the CS theory not stopping any finite number of steps. Therefore these steps should infinitely repeated, and thus we can construct an action which now has fully first class constraints by introducing infinite auxiliary fields denoted by $A^{(n)i}$. In this respect, all the previous results [6,7,10] of the BFT formalism applied to the CS cases are incomplete. Hence the final action can be written in the form of

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(0)i}\dot{A}^{(0)j} + \kappa A^{(0)0}\epsilon_{ij}\partial^i A^{(0)j} \\ & -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}A^{(n)i}\dot{A}^{(n)j} + \sqrt{\kappa}A^{(0)}\epsilon_{ij}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\partial^i A^{(n)j} \\ & -\sqrt{\kappa}\epsilon_{ij}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}A^{(n)i}\dot{A}^{(0)j} - \epsilon_{ij}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty}A^{(m)i}\dot{A}^{(n)j}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

To examine whether or not the action (18) gives really first class constraint system, we should check the constraint algebra by using the Poisson brackets. The canonical momenta from (18) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_0^{(0)} &= 0, \\ \pi_i^{(0)} &= \frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(0)j} + \sqrt{\kappa}\epsilon_{ij}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}A^{(n)j}, \\ \pi_i^{(n)} &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(n)j} + \epsilon_{ij}\sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty}A^{(m)j}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $n = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$. We thus have primary constraints as

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega_0 &= \pi^{(0)} \approx 0, \\
\Omega_i^{(0)} &= \pi_i^{(0)} - \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{(0)j} - \sqrt{\kappa} \epsilon_{ij} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A^{(n)j} \approx 0, \\
\Omega_i^{(n)} &= \pi_i^{(n)} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{(n)j} - \epsilon_{ij} \sum_{m=n+1}^{\infty} A^{(m)j} \approx 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

whose time stability conditions give one further constraint as

$$\Omega_3 = \kappa \epsilon_{ij} \partial^i \left(A^{(0)j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A^{(n)j} \right) \approx 0, \tag{21}$$

with the primary Hamiltonian density

$$\mathcal{H}_p = \mathcal{H}_c + v^0 \Omega_0 + \sum_{n,i} v^{(n)i} \Omega_i^{(n)}, \tag{22}$$

where the canonical Hamiltonian density is given by $\mathcal{H}_c = \kappa A^{(0)0} \epsilon^{ij} \partial_i (A^{(0)j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A^{(n)j})$. The constraint (21) is obtained only from the evolution of the Ω_0 and the other primary constraints do not generate any further constraints. The maximally irreducible first class constraints are now obtained from redefining the constraints (20) and (21) as $\omega_0 = \pi_0^{(0)} \approx 0$, $\omega_3 = \partial^i \pi_i^{(0)} + \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} \partial^i A^{(0)j} \approx 0$, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\omega}_i^{(1)} &= \pi_i^{(0)} - \frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{(0)j} - \sqrt{\kappa} (\pi_i^{(1)} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{(1)j}) \approx 0, \\
\tilde{\omega}_i^{(n+1)} &= \pi_i^{(n)} - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{(n)j} - (\pi_i^{(n+1)} + \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} A^{(n+1)j}) \approx 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $n = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$, and the total Hamiltonian density has the form of

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_T = \lambda^0 \omega_0 - (A^{(0)0} - \lambda^3) \omega_3 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{(n)i} \tilde{\omega}_i^{(n)}. \tag{24}$$

The above constraints are all involutive,

$$\{\omega_0, \tilde{H}_T\} = \omega_3, \quad \{\omega_3, \tilde{H}_T\} = 0, \quad \{\tilde{\omega}_i^{(n)}, \tilde{H}_T\} = 0. \tag{25}$$

So the new CS theory with the infinite auxiliary fields now completely forms the first class constrained system and strongly vanishing Poisson brackets between the constraints, ω_0 , ω_3 , and (23).

It seems to be appropriate to comment on the constraints, ω_0 , ω_3 , and (23). The constraint ω_3 is the usual Gauss' constraint related to the time independent gauge transformation and it is not modified through the BFT procedure, which reflects the maintenance of the well-known original U(1) gauge symmetry. On the other hand, the infinite number of the first class constraints (23) are related to a kind of unknown local symmetries and the symplectic structure of the original fields is regarded as a gauge fixed structure of the modified CS theory (18).

Now we are ready to discuss new local symmetries of our first class action. The first order form of the action is described as

$$S = \int d^3x \left(\pi_0^{(0)} \dot{A}^{(0)0} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \pi_i^{(n)} A^{(n)i} - \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_T \right). \quad (26)$$

This action is invariant under the following gauge transformations

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A^{(0)0} &= \epsilon^0, \\ \delta A^{(0)i} &= -\partial^i \epsilon^3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \epsilon^{(1)i}, \\ \delta A^{(n)i} &= -\epsilon^{(n)i} + \epsilon^{(n+1)i}, \\ \delta \pi^{(0)} &= 0, \\ \delta \pi_i^{(0)} &= -\frac{\kappa}{2} \epsilon_{ij} \partial^j \epsilon^3 - \frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{2} \epsilon_{ij} \epsilon^{(1)j}, \\ \delta \pi_i^{(n)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ij} \left(\epsilon^{(n)j} + \epsilon^{(n+1)j} \right), \\ \delta \lambda^0 &= \dot{\epsilon}^0, \\ \delta \lambda^{(1)i} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \dot{\epsilon}^{(1)i}, \quad \delta \lambda^{(n+1)i} = \dot{\epsilon}^{(n+1)i}, \\ \delta \lambda^3 &= \epsilon^0 + \dot{\epsilon}^3 \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

which are generated from the definition of the gauge transformation generators as

$$G = \int d^2x \left(\epsilon^0 \omega_0 + \epsilon^3 \omega_3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \epsilon^{(1)i} \tilde{\omega}_i^{(1)} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \epsilon^{(n)i} \tilde{\omega}_i^{(n)} \right), \quad (28)$$

with the infinitesimal gauge parameters ϵ^0 , ϵ^3 , and $\epsilon^{(n)i}$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$) where we have inserted $1/\sqrt{\kappa}$ in front of the parameters $\epsilon^{(1)i}$ for convenience. The equations of motion of

the Lagrange multipliers $\lambda^{(n)i}$ give the constraints $\tilde{\omega}_i^{(n)}$, while the $\lambda^{(n)i}$ themselves can be gauged away. Upon the gauge condition of $\lambda^3 = 0$ and thus $\delta\lambda^3 = 0$ [13], the action (26) reduces to

$$S = \int d^3x \left(\pi_0^{(0)} \dot{A}^{(0)0} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \pi_i^{(n)} A^{(n)i} - \lambda^0 \omega_0 + A^{(0)0} \omega_3 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda^{(n)i} \tilde{\omega}_i^{(n)} \right) \quad (29)$$

by identifying $\epsilon^0 = -\epsilon^3$. Note that the partially gauge fixed action (29) is invariant under the residual gauge transformations. To be exhausted all the additional gauge degrees of freedom, we choose gauge conditions as $\chi^{(n)i} = \pi_i^{(n)} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij}A^{(n)j} \approx 0$, ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) with Eq. (23) and $\lambda^{(n)i} = 0$ together, similarly to the case of chiral boson [15]. We can therefore recover the original pure CS Lagrangian (1) remaining only the usual U(1) gauge symmetry.

On the other hand, if one eliminates $\pi_0^{(0)}$, $\pi_i^{(0)}$, $\pi_i^{(n)}$, λ^0 , and $\lambda^{(n)i}$ ($n = 1, 2, \dots$) from the action (29) by means of their own equations of motion, we could get once again the desired action (18), and compactly rewrite it as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & -\frac{\kappa}{2}\epsilon_{ij} \left(A^{(0)i} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A^{(n)i} \right) \left(\dot{A}^{(0)j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \dot{A}^{(n)j} \right) \\ & + \kappa A^{(0)0} \epsilon_{ij} \partial^i \left(A^{(0)j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A^{(n)j} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Then one can easily check that this action is invariant under the following local gauge transformations of

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A^{(0)0} &= \partial^0 \Lambda, \\ \delta A^{(0)i} &= \partial^i \Lambda + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\kappa}} \epsilon^{(1)i}, \\ \delta A^{(n)i} &= -\epsilon^{(n)i} + \epsilon^{(n+1)i} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where we simply defined $\epsilon^3 = -\Lambda$. The transformation rules imply that the usual U(1) gauge transformation with the gauge parameter Λ and a new type of local symmetries with $\epsilon^{(n)i}$.

In conclusions, we have found a new type of the WZ action for the abelian pure CS theory. To make two initial second class constraints which are originated from the symplectic

structure into the first class system, we have introduced infinite number of the auxiliary fields via the BFT formalism. It is remarkable that not only the original $U(1)$ gauge symmetry is still preserved but also there exist the additional novel symmetries. Further, the derived WZ action is eventually independent of field theoretic models which involve the CS term. If nonabelian CS theory is considered in this way, some various applications may be possible, for example, the boundary conformal field theory of the CS theory and recent study of black hole physics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank S. J. Yoon for helpful discussions. The present study was supported by the Basic Science Research Institute Program, Ministry of Education, Project No. BSRI-98-2414. WTK is in part supported by Korea Science and Engineering Foundation through the Center for Theoretical Physics in Seoul National University (1998).

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Deser, R. Jackiw and s. Templeton, Ann. of Phys. **140**, 372 (1982); E. Witten, Commun. Math. Phys. **121**, 351 (1989); G. Moore and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B220**, 422 (1989); S. Elitzur, G. Moore, A. Schwimmer and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B326**, 108 (1989); S. Carlip, *Lectures on (2+1) Dimensional Gravity*, gr-qc/9503024; M. Bañados, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 5816 (1996).
- [2] R. Floreanini and R. Jackiw, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1692 (1988).
- [3] L. D. Faddeev and S. L. Shatashvili, Phys. Lett. **B167**, 225 (1986).
- [4] R. Jackiw and R. Rajaraman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1219 (1985).
- [5] E. G. Stückelberg, Helv. Phys. Acta. **30**, 209 (1957).
- [6] R. Banerjee, Phys. Rev. **D48**, R5467 (1993).
- [7] W. T. Kim and Y.-J. Park, Phys. Lett. **B336**, 376 (1994).
- [8] I. A. Batalin and E. S. Fradkin, Phys. Lett. **B180**, 157 (1986); Nucl. Phys. **B279**, 514 (1987); I. A. Batalin and I. V. Tyutin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A6**, 3255 (1991).
- [9] R. Banerjee, H. J. Rothe and K. D. Rothe, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 3750 (1995); *ibid.*, **D55**, 6339 (1997).
- [10] Y.-W. Kim, Y.-J. Park, K. Y. Kim and Y. Kim, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 2943 (1995).
- [11] R. Banerjee and J. Barcelos-Neto, Nucl. Phys. **B499**, 453 (1997); Yong-Wan Kim and K. D. Rothe, Nucl. Phys. **B511**, 510 (1998); W. Oliveira and J. A. Neto, to appear in Nucl. Phys., hep-th/9803258.
- [12] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on quantum mechanics* (Belfer graduate School, Yeshiba University Press, New York, 1964).
- [13] M. Henneaux and C. Teitelboim, *Quantization of Gauge systems* (Princeton University

Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1992).

[14] C. Wotzasek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 129 (1991).

[15] B. McClain, Y.-S. Wu and F. Yu, Nucl. Phys. **B343**, 689 (1990); F. Devecchi and M. Henneaux, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1606 (1996).

[16] P. Pasti, D. Sorokin and M. Tonin, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 4277 (1995); M. Aganagic, J. Park, C. Popescu and J. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. **B496**, 191 (1997).